New-York Daily Tribune.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 23, 1862.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

No notice can be taken of Anonymous Communications. Whatever is intended for insertion must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer—not necessarily for publication, but as a guaranty for his good faith.

We cannot undertake to return rejected Communications.

All business letters for this office should be addressed to "THE TRIBUNE," New-York.

THE TRIBUNE IN PITTSBURGH.—JOHN W. PITCOCK is our Agent in Pittsburgh for the sale of THE DAILY, SEMI-WEEKLY, and WEEKLY TRIBUNE. Any of our friends wishing THE TRIBUNE will please leave their address with Mr. Pitcock, opposite the Post-Office, who will deliver it to all parts of the city.

NEWS OF THE DAY.

THE WAR.

—All was quiet in Gen. Burnside's army at latest advices. Skirmishers on the Rappahannock above Fredericksburg report no forces of Rebel cavalry to be seen. Gen. Burnside's report is given in another column of our paper. He takes the entire responsibility of the late movement, not only relieving the President, Secretary Stanton, and Gen. Halleck from any share in it, but intimating that it was against their judgment.

—The following highly-honorable specimen of warfare is reported in a Richmond paper as having occurred on the Mississippi River: "On the afternoon of the 12th inst., the Yankee gunboat Essex, and a wooden boat, name unknown, anchored out of range of the lower battery. Capt. McLane's company of cavalry crossed the river in the night, and hired a negro to hail the Essex. The hail was promptly answered, and a small boat was sent ashore, when the cavalry fired, killing and wounding two of the Abolitionists."

—Mr. Seward has reconsidered his resignation, and resumed his place as Secretary of State. The Secretary of the Treasury has done the same. The President refused to receive either Mr. Seward's or Mr. Chase's resignation, on the ground that it would be incompatible with the public welfare.

—We have elaborate accounts of the Fredericksburg fight from Richmond papers. The statements of the Rebel loss are very blind. One writer foots up 1,750; but his text and table do not agree at all. From the arrivals of wounded at Richmond, we guess that their loss cannot be much less than 5,000.

GENERAL NEWS.

—In Senate yesterday, the Secretary of the Navy, in answer to inquiries concerning the chartering of vessels for the Banks Expedition, that Maj.-Gen. Banks was authorized to procure his vessels from Commodore Vanderbilt of New-York, but that no official report has been received in regard to the matter. The Secretary states, unofficially, that he was informed that the vessels were inspected by G. H. Van Brunt, and the engines by Chas. H. Haswell. A resolution was adopted to appoint a Committee to investigate the whole matter. The correspondence with the Russian Government relative to telegraphic communication between the mouth of the Amoor River and San Francisco, California, was sent to the Senate. The Naval Committee were instructed to inquire into the expediency of abolishing the marine corps as a naval organization, and attaching it to the army. A proposition was referred to appoint a Commissioner to settle Government accounts growing out of the rebellion with the various States. The resolution inquiring whether any State prisoner was required as a condition of discharge to swear not to prosecute those who arrested him, was passed. The bill relating to the discharge of State Prisoners was then taken up and discussed by Mr. Lane of Indiana, Mr. Saulsbury and Mr. Bayard.

In the House, the credentials of the Hon. Michael Hahn, member elect from the IId District of Louisiana, were presented and referred. Also, a resolution asking why soldiers were not paid. The Ways and Means Committee were instructed to inquire into the expediency of amending the Tax Law, so that licenses may be transferred and may be good in the hands of the assignee for the time given. Mr. Vallandigham offered a resolution in favor of making peace as early as possible. Bills were introduced proposing a temporary Government for Idaho, and to enable the Territories of Nevada, Utah and Colorado to form State Governments preliminary to their admission into the Union. A resolution of censure on the Secretary of the Navy was laid over. Information concerning the doings of our Minister in Mexico was called for. The Committee of Ways and Means were instructed to inquire into the expediency of amending the Tax law so that newspapers circulating not exceeding 2,500 copies may not be subject to tax. Mr. Bingham introduced a bill for the emancipation of the slaves of Rebels in the States and Territories of the United States. A resolution was passed, directing the Secretary of the Treasury to take immediate steps to pay soldiers and sailors, and preferring them before all other creditors. A resolution was adopted, raising a Committee to find out if any Government employees are interested in contracts. It was proposed to give gold medals to the brave soldiers who led the vanguard across the Rappahannock, at Fredericksburg. The House voted to adjourn from Tuesday to Jan. 5. A motion to take the bill for the liberation of slaves in rebellious States from the Committee was unsuccessful. Leave was granted to report a bill to aid emancipation in Missouri. A resolution, inquiring into the loyalty of Mr. Kennedy, Census Superintendent, was adopted. The Deficiency bill was passed, and the House adjourned.

—A meeting of Ministers and members of Christian Churches, was held at the Church of the Puritans in this city last evening, Mr. Edward Gilbert in the chair. A Committee consisting of the Rev. Dr. Cheever, the Rev. Nathan Brown, and the Rev. William Goodell, reported a memorial to the President and Congress of the United States, asking them to adopt a measure of emancipation for the enslaved on the basis of national justice and necessity. The report was unanimously adopted by the large meeting, which was composed of a very fair representation of the ministry of all denominations in New-York. Addresses were made by the Rev. Dr. Cheever, Mr. Edward Gilbert, the Rev. T. W. Conway, Major of the 24 Hawkins Zouaves, the Rev. Hiram Mattison, the Rev. Wm. Goodell, Dexter H. Hawkins, David Plumb, and others. The meeting was open for discussion, and the privilege was freely enjoyed in an orderly and becoming manner.

—By the arrival of the Union at this port, we have Cuban news to Dec. 15. The new Captain-General, the Marquis de Catelfort, arrived at Havana on the 10th inst., and Gen. Serrano, the former Captain-General, left on the 12th. Both the Spanish authorities and the English have of late displayed great sympathy with the Rebel cause. Still many of the Cubans sympathize with the Federal cause, and there is a good prospect that if we get rid of Slavery, Cuba will soon follow our example. Our Havana correspondent furnishes an interesting account of the revenue of Cuba, and the use Spain makes of it.

—A Committee of the Board of Councilmen yesterday reported in favor of taking ten thousand dollars out of the City Treasury and making a free gift of it to the Sixty-Ninth (Irish) Regiment. The Board tried to give Gen. Meagher (the distinguished Irish orator) an $800 sword, but the measure failed temporarily for want of the requisite vote. A resolution to establish a City Armory and Sword Manufactory to supply swords by the gross for presentation to all the political friends of the Councilmen, was offered but laid over. It was resolved to pave Division street from Bowery to Essex with trap. Donations were made of $1,475 to the State Woman's Hospital, and $3,000 to the Woman's Aid Society.

—The 242d anniversary of the Landing of the Prilgrims was celebrated last night by the New-England Society in the customary dinner, at the Astor House. Speeches were made by the Rev. Dr. Lothrop of Boston, Wm. M. Evarts, Henry Ward Beecher, Richard S. Storrs, Gens. Dwight and Andrews, John Van Buren, and others.

—Mayor Opdyke has vetoed the resolution giving $50,000 to the Roman Catholic Orphan Asylum, on the ground that the donation is too large, and the precedent will warrant any other religious association in asking a similar gift.

—By order of the Kings County Republican General Committee, the primary elections will be held this evening for the purpose of electing delegates to the next Republican General Committee of the County. See advertisement.

—The mails for Europe by the Arabia from Boston, will close at the New-York Post-Office this (Tuesday) afternoon at ¾ o'clock.

—The Stock market opened with a very heavy feeling in Government Securities, assisted by the Cabinet disturbance and doubts of the future. Sixes of 1881 Coupons sold at 102¾. Seven-thirties at 100¾, and One-year Certificates at 94¾. There was not much pressure to sell the 1881s, but the other descriptions were thrown on the market freely. Later in the day there was a sharp rally, with large bids. At the Second Board there was a marked change in feeling in regard to Government Securities, with a large business at a recovery of 1@1¼ per cent. The Share market was unusually active and busy. At the Third Board the market was steady, with a good demand for Governments. There is a small business in Foreign Bills, and the market is irregular. Freights are very dull and rates are somewhat heavy. Gold has been fairly active, but without improvement, change fluctuating between 132¼@132½. The current rate for money on good collaterals is 6@7 per cent, but many transactions with leading houses are made at 5@6 per cent. Paper is in fair demand at 5@6½ per cent.

The rumors which yesterday obtained circulation and credence about town, as to the rehabilitation of the Cabinet, are fully confirmed this morning by our Washington dispatches. As we have no further information to give in relation to the matter than is there printed, we refer the reader to those dispatches. Nor do we know that they give a precise relation of the facts, but receiving it for our part, on our faith in our correspondent, we lay it before the reader to accept it or not as he pleases. Mr. Lincoln, it is well known, is a man of great kindliness of nature, and it seems to us a most natural conclusion of this threatened change in the councils, and possibly in the policy, of the nation that he should have regulated his conduct by his reluctance to hurt anybody's feelings. At any rate, whatever the cause, the fact remains—the Cabinet is unchanged; the President has yielded to no pressure whether from without or within, whether general or particular, and we accept the situation of affairs as one which we have neither attempted to change or reinstate.

GEN. BURNSIDE'S REPORT.

Surely, the most reckless, the most hardened, of semi-traitors who have for the past week been shaking the country over the pit of perdition by their infamous falsehoods respecting "political generals" and the crossing and fighting of Gen. Burnside at Fredericksburg under protest but in obedience to peremptory orders from the War Department, must have been horror-struck at their own wickedness when they perused Gen. Burnside's manly and candid report of that fight, which reached us by telegraph yesterday. Hear what the Seymourite stipendiary in our city has been roundly asserting from day to day, to be promptly copied into *The Albany Argus* and thence ran the round of the minor party organs:

From The World, Wednesday, Dec. 17.

By Gen. Halleck's orders, the Army of the Rappahannock was marched up against the impregnable batteries of the Fredericksburg heights, brigade after brigade, division after division, one after another decimated, thousands upon thousands slaughtered, from daybreak until sunset, until its ruin was complete, until well nigh twenty thousand brave and noble souls wet the Virginia fields with their blood. * * * Again have you, ABRAHAM LINCOLN, by the hands of HENRY W. HALLECK and EDWIN M. STANTON, sent death to thousands upon thousands of our brothers and friends," &c., &c. * * *

"Burnside ought to have suspected that he was walking into the jaws of destruction, but no matter; *his orders were peremptory*, and as a soldier he could only obey." &c., &c. * * * "Gen. Burnside *acted under strict orders*; he was compelled to move upon Fredericksburg by peremptory directions from Washington, which domineered over his judgment and extorted its obedience." &c., &c.

—Column after column like the above is "approved" in the most impassioned, incendiary appeals to the President to "cut loose, now and finally, from his past and fatal policy," with all manner of assertions and insinuations that "the Radicals" were responsible for this attack, when Stanton, Halleck, and Burnside never in their lives voted any but a Democratic ticket, and Halleck's is of the extremest type of Pro-Slavery conservatism.

—Now see how Gen. Burnside, in his frank and truthful report of Friday last just published, disposes of the above fearful inculpations:

Major-Gen. H. W. HALLECK, General-in-Chief, &c.

"GENERAL: I have the honor to offer the following reasons for moving the Army of the Potomac across the Rappahannock *sooner than was anticipated by the President, Secretary of War, or yourself, and for crossing at a point different from the one indicated to you at our last meeting at the President's.*" * * * *

"The fact that I decided to move from Warrenton on to this line, *rather against the opinion of the President, Secretary of War, and yourself, and that you left the whole movement in my hands, without giving me orders*, makes *me* the one responsible." * * *

"I will add here that the movement was made *earlier than you expected, and after the President, Secretary, and yourself requested me not to be in haste*, for the reason that we were supplied much sooner by the different staff departments than was anticipated when I last saw you."

—What excuse, what palliation, of their horrible crime can the authors of the atrocious calumnies so thoroughly exposed by Gen. Burnside devise? Have they a right to sneak away from public scorn and indignation under the pretext that they were misled? By whom? How? On whose authority? Give us names and dates! In a crisis of exceeding public peril, when our whole political fabric rocks to its foundations, journals that pretend to character and truth fulminate column after column of utterly baseless slanders, calculated to destroy every vestige of public trust in those called to administer the Government, including the President who must remain President for the next twenty-seven-months. These calumnies were directly and powerfully calculated to destroy all confidence in those at the head of our National Councils, and who must be the nucleus of our trying struggle for National life. Vainly did we urge, day by day, the public peril of diffusing such incitements to general consternation; vainly did we plead for delay—for time to ascertain the material facts. We were cried down as a "Radical," fanatic and factionist, caring nothing for the country so that "the negro" should be pampered and exalted. And now what explanation will the allied traducers make? What trick shall save them from the wrath of an injured and imperiled people?

BURNSIDE DEFENDED.

The North American (Philadelphia) is the only journal, so far as we have seen, that squarely defends Gen. Burnside's strategy at Fredericksburg. As the article is very able, and as many will be curious to see what can be said on that side, we print it entire, begging every one to bear in mind that the views it expresses are not ours. Here it is:

THE BATTLE OF FREDERICKSBURG.

A few days ago, we remarked that the first accounts of battles generally differ in the most remarkable manner from those which finally obtain a place in history, being exaggerated, distorted and inaccurate. At the time we wrote, we had no idea that this would so soon be exemplified in the accounts of one of the most fearful battles on record, one in the contemplation of which the heart sickens, and the imagination grows weary of the vain attempt to embrace the details of the horrible slaughter. The revelations of this week have scared a place in the memory of the present generation, the like of which may not, and, we trust, will not, occur again. A struggle so tremendous in the size of the armies engaged, so fearful in its concomitants, so appalling in its results, and so brief in its duration, deserves to be memorable in our annals for all time to come, and yet the first accounts treated it as a mere reconnoissance or skirmish.

Some of our extemporaries are racing their brains to find the means of belittling this prodigious slaughter. If they were not in so great a hurry to judge of every event in the very instant that the first telegram arrives—if they were not so big with counsel and portentous with their threats—if, in short, they had but a little of that cool bravery which is the pre-eminent quality of an officer in battle, and should be possessed by all who undertake to counsel generals, they would wait patiently until they were furnished with accurate details, and then judge calmly and philosophically. There is no need for any one to apologize for this great battle, or to attempt to belittle it into a reconnoissance in force, or to ensure the generals who undertook it, or to explain it away into what it was not. It was a prodigious attempt to achieve a great result, and it was a prodigious failure. When such things do fail as all, they always fail in this way. No partial failure is, in the nature of things, possible. If the event proves a victory, as it often does, it is never a mere strategistic or tactical victory; it becomes a momentous triumph, memorable through all succeeding time.

Burnside was unsuccessful in his attempt, but Napoleon was equally unsuccessful at Aspern and Essling, and his failure at Waterloo was awful. Burnside has made no blunder. His plan was worthy of the best General in Europe. He had used it before with skill and success at Roanoke Island and Newbern, and although he failed in the present case, that does not prove that the plan itself was defective. The main feature of his military system seems to be to attack the enemy's center in force, and to attack always in column. Some of the very wise men, who think the President and cabinet ought to resign, say that both these ideas were wrong, and that the progress of the war has exploded them. We do not believe a word of this, and we will say why.

We have already stated that both at Roanoke Island and at Newbern, these two Napoleonic ideas were used by Burnside, and were the leading features of his operations. He paid no attention to outposts, to flanking efforts, etc. In this he was right. Baron Jomini expressly says, in his Summary of the Art of War, that these flanking operations lengthen an army by making its line too thin and weak, so that an attack by the enemy may easily break it; and if the flanking party is separated and sent by a detour to make a rear diversion, it is very apt to fall through a mistake of route, or delays of various kinds, and, if encountered by the enemy in force, is sure to be annihilated. In the desperate battle of Spottsylvania, Sigel's flank attack was a disastrous failure, and his whole division was cut up, despite the great skill of the General, and his tried abilities on many a hard fought field.

In war, the most obvious and reliable art of all efforts by Generals, of every grade and talent, is to confront the enemy. Napoleon achieved his greatest and most wonderful of all his successes by avoiding this hackneyed mode of operations, and striking his whole force on a single desperate attack of the center. Perhaps it will be said that every General is not a Napoleon, and therefore such risks ought to be avoided. To this we reply that to every battle where these fearful attacks of the center proved successful, there was on the very brink of destruction. In his first signal victory at Marengo, the battle was actually lost; his army was then badly beaten and flying in all directions, when Desaix arrived. He, too, thought the field lost; but Napoleon renewed the combat with the fresh troops, and won the day by his attack on the center. Wagram was a memorable instance of this terrible risk, and the terrible slaughter of Macdonald's column in the decisive charge still causes the reader of history to thrill as he ponders on it.

Our soldiers at Fredericksburg were not a whit worse than those of Napoleon. His troops recoiled in many a battle before the serial fire of the opposing army, and the best troops in the world sometimes fail in a charge. The British storming party failed at the Redan before Sevastopol. They fled like sheep at Bunker Hill and New-Orleans. Napoleon's veterans from a hundred battle-fields were scattered to the winds at Waterloo. It is idle to expect that men with remaining faculties will not recoil before such horrors as our troops encountered at Fredericksburg. It may be said that if this is true, the charge in column and on the center must be an error. But here is just the point where modern military science shows itself most triumphantly.

Napoleon knew that the risk of such a charge was awful, and that as in a great war it must always be increased by the fact that most of the troops in the field are new levies, and, therefore, to a certain extent untrustworthy, means must be found to guard against the possibility of their being able to make to flight. To do this he made his charging columns always very heavy, that however great the slaughter might be in front, no one could turn and flee, as the vast multitude pressing forward in the rear prevented it. Macdonald's charging column at Wagram carried out some eighteen thousand strong, and when it reached the Austrian lines had only eighteen hundred left. But it broke the enemy's line and gained the victory.

Something of these tactics was resorted to by Burnside in the late battle. When Meagher's Division, after its successful charge, broke before the fearful fire of the enemy, Hinks's Division was immediately pushed forward, and drove back the enemy, and took several hundred prisoners. This method of attack is now the accepted one in all the European armies. The Russians used it at Inkerman, and despite the dreadful slaughter, they would undoubtedly have succeeded but for the timely arrival of the French. Napoleon III. used it at Magenta and Solferino, and the carnage was so great that for months after these conflicts the Emperor's nerves were completely unsettled, and his mind filled with morbid images. Santa Anna adopted it at Buena Vista, and at one time, notwithstanding the bravery of our troops and the strength of our position, he came near succeeding. But Taylor arrived at the right spot at the opportune moment, and renewed the battle with Bragg's battery, O'Brien's having been lost.

Here is just the perilous point. This method of attack is never a thing without risk, and requires a General of great resources and unbounded courage. When the slaughter is greatest, he must be able to command himself most. This was where the mighty genius of Napoleon shone resplendent. Riding amid the thunder and the horrors of the battle, he seized upon the moment of fearful peril to make his decisive charge with all his force, lending to it all the enthusiasm and courage which his own example could infuse into his men. We are afraid that Burnside committed an error in not allowing Sumner to go on the field and take the command of his men at the critical moment. The old hero chafed at being prevented. He would be most at home in the midst of danger, and, had he been allowed to go, he would have saved the day, and perhaps have won the battle. Burnside himself could have done it, or Hooker or Heintzelman.

We do not think Burnside deserves censure for his plan of this battle. It was an attempt not merely to defeat the Rebel army, but to annihilate it. Had he succeeded in his attempt to pierce the center and seize the railroad in the rear, their retreat would have been cut off, the whole Rebel army divided into two fragments and attacked in front, flank and rear. It is worth all the men we have lost to have tried to gain such a victory; and so far from visiting any one with blame for it, we, for our own part, are rather rejoiced to find that at last we have some one able to make a plan of action worth the risk incurred in carrying it out. The victor of Roanoke Island and Newbern is not a man to be daunted at trifles, and we trust this great Republic will not be led into censuring him too hastily.

DISUNIONISM FACTITIOUS.

Whoever read carefully the batch of correspondence recently seized by our soldiers at the residence in Oxford, Miss., of the Hon. Jacob Thompson, Mr. Buchanan's Secretary of the Interior, must have been struck by the following passage in Mr. Thompson's own letter to ex-President Buchanan, dated June 7th, 1861:

"In all I did, I acted on life-long convictions, and after I reached home [because] desirous that the severance which had begun should then be perpetual,—a new desire for me. I feared that that blunderer, Lincoln, would turn and adopt my ideas of State rights. *Had he done so, Secession would have been killed off forever.* Had Lincoln, in his inaugural, boldly taken the ground that he would evacuate the forts of Sumter and Pickens, and leave the seceded States to determine for themselves their own destiny, the Border States would have been secured to the old Union beyond peradventure, and in all the seceded States there would have been a Union party *which would have asserted* its ASCENDENCY IN ALL OUR STATES. This feeling was deep and strong when I came home. But the very moment Lincoln suspended the Constitution and the laws, and undertook to raise armies and support navies without the aid of Congress, the feeling for separation became universal. Now, nothing but annihilation will bring these States into the old Union."

—Because THE TRIBUNE, during the last two months of 1860, insisted that the Cotton States—being the only ones then threatening Secession—should be invited to decide for themselves whether to remain in or go out of the Union, we have been assailed ever since by the Northern Pro-Slavery press as *wishing the Union dissolved*. Nothing can be further from the truth. We sought to concede to the disaffected States the right, not of Secession, but of Self-Government, because we felt sure that this concession would retain them peacefully in the Union. Had the North then said kindly but firmly to those States, "We do not wish to part with you; but, if you *will* go, go in peace," their traitorous demagogues would have been utterly taken aback and disconcerted. They had been for years fomenting disunion under the guise of rescuing the South from oppression and spoliation by the North. And, ridiculous as was that pretense, our own Pro-Slavery demagogues were constantly giving it countenance by crying out, whenever anything was said or done in opposition to the series of aggressions of the Slave Power which became pronounced in the Annexation of Texas, "There! if you don't stop that, the South will secede—the Union will be dissolved—and we shall all be ruined! No more trade—no more manufactures—no more markets—no more profits—if the Cotton States shall secede!" We always despised this appeal to the cowardice, the venality, the baseness of the North, and always treated it accordingly. If the Union is beneficial to one section alone—if its advantages are not general and reciprocal—it should not exist. If we are to buy its continuance by stifling our convictions, padlocking our mouths, and making merchandise of our souls, it could not be ended too soon. In fact, it could never be maintained on the assumption that its material benefits were all monopolized by one section, while its burdens were all thrown upon another. And nothing else has done so much to strengthen and disseminate the Southern delusion on this head, as the shrieks of alarm frequently raised at the North over the prospect of disunion, as though it was to be specially injurious to the North—as though the South would no longer buy and sell with us if the Union were dissolved, and as though we lived not by our own industry and ability, but by the favor and patronage of the Cotton-growers. Hence the incessant threats of disunion from the South; not that disunion was really desired or anticipated, but because this was deemed by the Democratic managers at the South a sure and safe mode of helping and strengthening their party friends at the North. To threaten disunion was, in their view, to threaten the North with bankruptcy and ruin—for this was generally admitted at the North. Hence the natural deduction that the South—that is, the Slave Power—had only to make any demand, require any concession, no matter how unreasonable, and back it by a threat of disunion, and the North would certainly concede it, having no alternative but beggary and utter prostration.

Mr. Thompson, writing to his bosom friend Buchanan, three months after Mr. Lincoln's inauguration and nearly two after the bombardment of Fort Sumter—writing confidentially, and with no thought that his letter would ever see the light—confirms all we have ever asserted with regard to the Unionism of the South. We steadily maintained that the People of the South were *not* Disunionists—that the great mass of them loyal and hoped to live and die in the Union—and Mr. Thompson fully corroborates our statement. We maintained that an offer by the Free States to let the Cotton States out of the Union if they desired it, after a fair hearing and on a clear understanding among all parties, would show this, and thus give a death-blow to Secession. Mr. Thompson confirms every syllable that we uttered. But our Democrats were so intent on forcing the Republicans to prove recreant to their principles—so determined to have no settlement that did not involve new concessions, new abasements to Slavery, that they howled down every proposition to test the real strength of Disunionism at the South: and hence we are as we are.

It would be amusing, but for the melancholy proof afforded of human depravity, to note that several leading journals that, a very few weeks ago, were falsely accusing THE TRIBUNE of wanting nothing done in the way of putting down the Rebellion till after the 1st of January, now turn a short corner and assert that THE TRIBUNE has been urging Gen. Burnside to advance and attack the enemy at Fredericksburg! We have not been doing much in the line of strategic suggestion for some time, judging the business very fully attended to by others. We have not even abused the Government for sending Gen. Banks away "South," and intend not to till we understand the matter more clearly. We do not see how Gen. Banks could have been of much service in Virginia if present; for we were worsted at Fredericksburg by the strength of the enemy's position and the fearful inferiority of our own. It looks to us that more of our men in Fredericksburg on that fatal day would only have made the matter worse. Nor could a diversion on the James, or by way of North Carolina, have been of much effect. Placing an army on each side of the Rebels, thus enabling them to strike first one, then the other, with superior force, is the very error of Gen. McClellan's advance on Richmond by way of the York Peninsula. Let us at least profit by our past errors.

ADVICE TO CLERGYMEN.

Whereas, in these times of public peril there seems to be some doubt of the exact duty of Ministers of the Gospel in the premises—whether while a fierce rebellion is raging against the Government they shall make any allusion to that fact in their pulpits—whether High Treason, while it is something which may be prayed against, is also something which must not be preached against—whether lukewarmness in sustaining the Government is not an immorality deserving of pastoral censure—whether the measureless content of a flock be proof positive of its pastor's fidelity—whether the absconding of certain sheep from the fold establishes the incapacity of the shepherd—whether the Morphine Velvet or Bonnerges style of preaching be that which in stormy periods should be adopted, and

Whereas, the opinion of a certain journal of this city in matters of Ecclesiastical Polity is entitled to the highest consideration, both from the known piety of its conductors, and the logical and literary elegance of their daily lay preaching,

Therefore, we beg leave, with all due humility, to call the attention of all concerned to the following explicit suggestion, which is printed in the journal aforesaid: "As things are, we should advise the clergymen to enjoy their salaries, and go on in the old way, as Christ and the Apostles did, in the very heart and midst of Slavery."

—Can any advice be better than this? Can anything be more respectful to Ministers of the Gospel than to advise them "to enjoy their salaries"? It is as if we should say: What is the first duty of a Clergyman? To draw his salary! What is his second duty? To enjoy it! To this we might add: What is the first duty of a Church? To pay up promptly and liberally, if pleased! What is the second duty of a Church? To cut off the supplies if not pleased.

What can the Minister of Him who had not where to lay his head want more than a genteel house, a choice library, a good coat with a plenty of seams in it, a perfectly complacent congregation—in short, all peace and no sword? Do the sins of the world trouble him? Let him draw his salary! Is his congregation froward? There is balm at the bankers! Hasn't his Church bought him, body, soul, and spirit? And paid him his price? Why not take things easily?

The journal in question informs us, and it is what we did n't know before, that the Apostles enjoyed their salaries. We never heard of more than one of them who received any salary at all, and so far from enjoying it, he kept only enough to buy a rope, with which he hanged himself.

We doubt if a more bitter insult to the Clergy of New-York was ever penned, than this which comes from their professed defender. It puts them directly into the category of hirelings, of self-seekers, of Scribes and Pharisees, of men worldly, indolent, and, as vendors of the Gospel, shrewdly knavish. Luther never said a sharper thing of the Romish priesthood, and the Dissenters of England, in the exceeding wrath of their dissent, never uttered a sorrier invendo.

It further makes the remarks to which we have referred, in connection with certain troubles in Christ's Church, now, we believe, happily adjusted. It says that the old Rector left his charge, because his flock would not listen to abolition preaching. A correspondent of another journal says that he left for private reasons of his own. It is n't for us to adjust these ecclesiastical differences. We have only to express the hope and belief that the new Rector will think of something more than "enjoying his salary."

There is one other point upon which we entreat the clergy to be careful. What business have they to hold meetings to consider the state of the country and their relation to it? Daring to hold such meetings, they are civilly asked why they do not convene them in Tammany Hall. Well, why not? The men who are so outraged by the patriotism of the reverend gentlemen go to Tammany Hall, and, for that matter, upon their knees to Tammany Hall, in quest of nominations, and in pursuit of place and of its profits. If Tammany is good enough for them—the lay guardians of the church—the keepers of the keepers—the very critics of God's own embassadors—isn't it good enough for the embassadors themselves? Clergymen—some of them, at least—feel it to be their duty to go everywhere—the lower the place, the higher the duty—to seek out the poor, the sinful, the degraded! Pray, why should Tammany be shunned? Is n't it poor enough? sinful enough? degraded enough? It has n't usually been considered the part of a good missionary to be fastidious in the selection of his field of labor. If clergymen can go to the Five Points, why not to Tammany?

There was a time when these critics of clergymen were not so fastidious—when it was thought a most admirable discharge of parochial duty to preach sermons in support of the Fugitive Slave Bill—when it was deemed evangelical in the most agitating way to denounce agitation—when Dr. Lord made presents of his little pamphlets to Dr. Fuller and Dr. Fuller made presents of his little pamphlets to Dr. Lord—when Abolitionists were smitten, hip and thigh, Sunday after Sunday, in sour, serious and savage sermons. That wasn't political preaching, we suppose. But now, when no calling can be so sacred that this wild war, waged for Slavery, does not menace its usefulness and prosperity—when the Church is threatened through anarchy with extinction—when it is a question whether the clergyman shall have any church to preach in, any house to live in, any flock to guard or any country to love, he is to have no eyes, hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions? He is to "enjoy his salary!" Why what more than that do the fat fakirs of India or the gross inmates of the Thibetian lamaseries do?

MASSACHUSETTS AND SOUTH CAROLINA.

A New-York newspaper suggests that as "Massachusetts and South Carolina made the war, they should be left to fight it out." This is one of those flippant comments upon public affairs, which being strongly suggestive of secondary juvenility, get into circulation because they are easy to read, although Heaven knows that they are hard enough to understand! Massachusetts has had, it is true, several quarrels with South Carolina, but as she has had law and the Constitution upon her side in every one of them, it is difficult to see how she has "made war." If she has, then every man makes war who declines to be tamely swindled, and appeals to God and his country for redress. South Carolina undertook to nullify the tariff, and Massachusetts joined with a President for whom she never voted, in resisting that original act of rebellion—but was standing by Andrew Jackson, in defence of the Constitution and the laws, an act of aggressive warfare? South Carolina passed a law imprisoning Colored Seamen, which her own jurists pronounced unconstitutional. Massachusetts sent a Commissioner to test the law in the Courts of South Carolina, and because it was perfectly known in that State that the Law could not stand judicial investigation for a moment, Mr. Hoar was driven by a mob out of Charleston. Who made war in that case? A Senator from Massachusetts pronounced a speech in his place, which he had a perfect right to make, and for which he was half murdered, on the floor of the Senate, by a Representative from South Carolina. Who made war then? The simple truth of history is, that there has been no quarrel between Massachusetts and South Carolina in which the State first named has not been absolutely in the right. How absurd is it, then, to charge Massachusetts with making war! It is n't making war to resist insolent demands. It is n't making war to insist that liberty of speech in Congress shall be respected. It is n't making war to insist that the laws shall be executed.

But it will be said that Massachusetts nullified the Fugitive Slave law. What interest had South Carolina in that? She lost no fugitives, and nobody shall persuade us that at any time or under any circumstances she wept very profusely for the injuries of Virginia. She never loved her tobacco-chewing sister well enough for that. Besides, it appears that South Carolina herself always pronounced the Fugitive Slave Law unconstitutional, and though, for different reasons, never liked it any better than Massachusetts did. And, finally, if you come to the pinch of the argument, it is conclusive that the Fugitive Slave Law was executed in Boston more than once, and that too by the public authorities of Massachusetts, in the very teeth of popular opposition—by the police aid, and the military aid and the judicial aid of the State and City. The authorities could not prevent a good deal of social discontent—but they put it down by the strong arm of the law, as well as by several communications written to the newspapers by Mr. George T. Curtis—and much gratitude slaveholders have displayed for the service.

Such is the political record of Massachusetts. We have made no account of her vote in the last Presidential Election, in which, although she bore an honorable and leading part, she merely acted with a majority of the States, some of them far outnumbering her in population and surpassing her in political power, if not in direct political influence. If she alone were responsible for that result, it is certain that no offense against the Constitution could be deduced from her action in the premises, the weight of which must not be shared by others. In no sense, can she, by the exercise of no undisputed right, be said to have made war. She voted for her candidate, and South Carolina did not do less.

Of the moral hostility of Massachusetts to Slavery, it is fair that we should speak. Frankly, it must be admitted that she does not like the system. Those who assert that she regards with honorable scorn all claim to a right of property in man, in the abstract, do her simple justice; nor do we seek to change that estimate of her sentiments. Her citizens must be content to stand with all other good, true, and enlightened men of the century and of every Christian country in the world. The right of opinion implies the right of expressing it; and especially so when opinion is assailed by plain and practical legislative measures. That right has been exercised by Massachusetts, but so it has been by all New-England, by the Middle States, and by the great States of the West. The North has been critical of Southern morals, but who can say that the South, in denouncing us as a selfish, penurious, grasping race of freethinkers and sharpers, has not amply returned our little compliments? But to dislike man-selling, man-stealing, the theft of children, the general debauchery of women, the pilfering of the laborer, the perversion of Christianity to sheer Satanic purposes, and to say as loudly and as sharply as possible that we disliked these, was not an act of war, nor would it have been so construed by Slaveholders, if there had not been in their hearts a lurking suspicion that they could secure no good repute in this world which they did not purchase.

It is childish to talk of war "made" both by Massachusetts and South Carolina. One party in this terrible struggle must be the conqueror; and if it be Massachusetts, then she stands with the Free States equally guilty;